

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/901,531	07/09/2001	Brian C. Barnes	2000.054600	2000.054600 7123	
23720	7590 07/31/2006		EXAMINER		
	S, MORGAN & AME	BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J			
	MOND, SUITE 1100 TX 77042	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			2134		
			DATE MAIL ED: 07/21/200	DATE MAILED: 07/31/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/901,531	BARNES ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Christopher J. Brown	2134

	Christopher J. Brown	2134	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 13 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing 	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount thortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of se appeal. Since
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further composition (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belomore) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	II be entered and an o	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>ne</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)	

TCI

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As per the applicants argument that Nay does not teach signaling a security violation, even assuming that the checksum equates to an authentication code. The examiner argues that if a problem is detected it is inherent that it would be signaled, so that appropriate action could be taken. In this instance the data be resent. The claimed limitation of "signal a security violation" does not explicitly teach an external signal, or a signal to a user. Therefore Nay teaches signaling a security violation. The applicant also argues that grounds, or motivation for Roech-Nay must be found in the prior art. It is also possible that motivation may come from the level of knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and does not have to be found in the art itself. The examiner has motivational statements in the previous office action. The applicant also argues hindsight reasoning. The examiner argues that it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper.

ARONES LOLIS JACOLES NER 2100 SUPERVISORY CENTER 2100 SUPERVISORY CENTER 2100